

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/531,978	03/20/2000	Edward I. Sun	AVERP2720US	6960	
7	590 12/22/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
Armand P Boisselle			ZIRKER, DANIEL R		
Renner Otto Boisselle & Sklar LLP 1621 Euclid Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
19th Floor			1771		
Cleveland, OH 44115			DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/531,978	SUN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel Zirker	1771	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess
THE REPLY FILED 15 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average in all the properties of the section under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply n places the applicat	to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection.	n. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate or the final (opriate extension Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	·. ·
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· • ———		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 		•	
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consi e Continuation Sheet.	dered but does NOT	place the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	newly
 For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims wo 			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:	DANIEL ZIRKE Primary exam Group 1300	RINER Janul	Zuku
	170		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner continues to rely upon the rationale set forth in the Final Rejection dated 10/15/04, as further noted here. In particular, the Examiner believes that as regards applicants' arguments set forth against the 102/103 rejection of the great majority of the claims the Examiner must again note that JP '971 discloses broad genus of three layer films one layer of which is an outer adhesive layer (e.g. page 5, lines 5-17, page 6, bottom four lines) which can be formed from the same materials applicants utilize and which are processed in the same or very similar manner to be utilized in the same end products that applicants contemplate. Thus to argue (e.g. Response, page 3, lines 8-9) that "JP '971 neither teaches or suggests multilayer films of the type utilized in applicants' labelstocks." is simply strongly disagreed with.